UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,077	01/31/2001	Eric G. Lang	MS#150410.1/40062.85US01	8009

7590 06/03/2004

Homer L. Knearl
Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _15 March 2004_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-13,15-32 and 34-40_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-13, 15-32, and 34-40_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 03/15/04.

2.   Claims 1-13, 15-32, and 34-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 23, 26, 28-29,

and 36 are independent claims. In Amendment A, claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 23, 26, 28, 29, 34, and 36

are amended. This action is made final.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   Claims 1-3, 6-8, 17-18, 22-23, 25-26, 28-29, 35-36, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,222 B1).

As to claims 1, 23, and 36, Narayanaswami teaches a user interface suitable for a small

computing device, the user interface comprising:

a display screen having a display surface on said display screen (a user interface, col. 3

lines 1-16, and fig. 8A);

a bezel encircling said display screen (bezel, col. 5 lines 60-67, and figs. 4, 8A-B), said

bezel at least one of horizontally and vertically movable (elements 310 and 312 of fig. 4 are

selected/moved horizontally, and elements 314 and 316 are selected/moved vertically) along a

plane substantially in parallel with said display surface (the bezel 400 is moving parallel on the

top of an annular plate 420 of fig. 6B when turning the bezel for selections); and

a cursor displayed within said display screen, wherein said cursor is responsive to movement of said bezel (display cursor scrolling function for text and graphics, col. 3 lines 5-15, and col. 5 lines 43-46).

As to claim 2, Narayanaswami teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein said cursor includes a pointing icon cursor (col. 5 lines 40-47).

As to claim 3, Narayanaswami teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein said cursor includes a highlighted selection cursor (selecting a cursor highlighted icon, col. 9 lines 1-25, and fig. 7).

As to claim 6, Narayanaswami teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein said bezel includes bezel buttons (col. 5 lines 25-60).

As to claim 7, Narayanaswami teaches the user interface of claim 1, wherein said bezel includes at least one touch sensor, said touch sensor operative to virtually move said bezel in response to finger contact without actually moving said bezel (touch sensitive screen panel, col. 5 lines 35-55).

As to claim 8, Narayanaswami teaches the user interface of claim 1, further comprising:

a display surface on said display screen (a user interface, col. 3 lines 1-16, and fig. 8A); and

wherein said bezel is rotatable about an axis, said axis being normal to said display surface (col. 5 lines 25-60, and figs. 8A-B).

As to claims 11 and 31, Nagayanaswami teaches the user interface,

wherein said bezel is pivotable about a pivot point, said pivot point located on an axis normal to said display surface (the center of the clock, fig. 8A-B).

As to claim 17, Nagayanaswami teaches the user interface of claim 1, further comprising at least one movement sensor configured to provide a movement signal when movement of said bezel occurs (the wheel generates a signal as a mouse device would when rolled, col. 5 lines 39-65).

As to claim 18, Nagayanaswami teaches the user interface of claim 17, wherein said movement sensor is a micro-switch (the wheel generates a signal as a mouse device would when rolled, col. 5 lines 39-65).

As to claims 22 and 25, Nagayanaswami teaches the user interface, wherein said bezel includes at least one touch sensor responsive to finger contact (touch sensitive screen panel, col. 5 lines 35-55).

As to claim 26, this is a method claim of system claim 1. Note the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 28, Nagayanaswami teaches a portable Internet device, the device comprising:

a display screen displaying Internet data (Internet text data, col. 7 lines 18-30);

a bezel encircling said display screen (bezel, col. 5 lines 60-67, and figs. 4, 8A-B), said bezel movable in a parallel direction relative to said display screen (elements 310 and 312 of fig. 4 are selected/moved horizontally, and elements 314 and 316 are selected/moved vertically); and

at least one movement sensor configured to provide a movement signal when movement of said bezel occurs (display cursor scrolling function for text and graphics, col. 3 lines 5-15, col. 5 lines 35-60, and col. 5 lines 43-46).

As to claim 29, this is a combination of claims 1 and 11. Note the rejections of claim 1 and 11 above.

As to claims 35 and 40, Nagayanaswami teaches the user interface, wherein said bezel is moveable to a combination of rotated, pivoted, and planar positions (it can be rejected under similar rationale as claim 1 above).

As to claim 38, Nagayanaswami teaches the user interface of claim 36, wherein said bezel is rotatable about a center axis, said center axis being normal to said display surface and passing through a center point on said display screen (col. 5 lines 35-60, and figs. 7, 8A-B).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,222 B1) in view of Moon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,433,801).

As to claim 4, Narayanaswami fails to teach a cursor including scrollbar cursor. Moon clearly teaches a cursor including scrollbar cursor (fig. 3, #132). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cursor including the scrollbar cursor taught by Moon with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to enable the user to view textual data that is otherwise inaccessible due to the limited space of the display device.

3.   Claims 5, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 30, 32, 34, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (US 6,525,997) in view of Rosenberg et al (US 6,219,032).

As to claim 5, Narayanaswami fails to teach a cursor including a text-selection cursor. Rosenberg teaches a cursor including a text-selection cursor (fig. 21). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cursor including a text-selection cursor taught by Rosenberg with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to enable the user to select textual data displayed in a list.

As to claim 9, Narayanaswami teaches a bezel (see the rejection of claim 1 above); however, Narayanaswami fails to teach biasing to a non-rotated position. Rosenberg clearly teaches of biasing to a non-rotated position (fig. 20c; col. 57, lines 40 - 60). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine biasing to a non-rotated position taught by Rosenberg with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a method for automatically resetting the bezel to the home position.

As to claim 10, Narayanaswami fails to teach a spring-like bezel for biasing said bezel to said non-rotated position. Rosenberg teaches a biasing said settings to said non-rotated position (fig. 20c; col. 57, lines 40 - 60). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine spring-like coupling of said cursor to the non-rotated position taught by Rosenberg with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a method for automatically resetting the bezel to the said non-rotated position.

As to claims 12, 30 and 39, Narayanaswami fails to teach biasing to a non-pivoted position. Rosenberg clearly teaches biasing to a non-pivoted position (fig. 20c; col. 57, lines 40 60). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine biasing to a non-pivoted position to the non-rotated position taught by Rosenberg

with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a method for automatically

resetting the bezel to the said non-rotated position.

As to claim 13, Narayanaswami teaches a bezel being a pivotal about a pivot point (see

the rejection of claim 1 above); however, Narayanaswami fails to teach a spring-like bezel for

biasing said bezel to said non-rotated position. Rosenberg teaches a spring coupled with the

bezel biasing to said non-pivoted position (fig. 20c; col. 57, lines 40 - 60). It would have been

obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine spring-like

coupling of said cursor to the non- pivoted position taught by Rosenberg with the smart watch

disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a method for automatically resetting the bezel to the said

non- pivoted position.

As to claim 15, Narayanaswami teaches a bezel being a pivotal about a pivot point (see

the rejection of claim 1 above); however, Narayanaswami fails to teach biasing to the rest

position. Rosenberg teaches biasing to the rest position (fig. 20c; col. 57, lines 40 - 60). It would

have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine

biasing to the rest position taught by Rosenberg with the smart watch disclosed by

Narayanaswami to provide a method for automatically resetting the bezel to the home position.

As to claim 16, Narayanaswami teaches a bezel being a pivotal about a pivot point (see

the rejection of claim 1 above). Rosenberg teaches a spring-like coupling with biasing to the rest

position (fig. 20c; col. 57, lines 40 - 60); however, Narayanaswami fails to teach a spring-like

bezel for biasing said bezel to said non-rotated pivoted position. Rosenberg teaches a biasing

said settings to said non-rotated position (fig. 20c; col. 57, lines 40 - 60). It would have been

obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine spring-like

coupling of said cursor to the non-rotated or original position taught by Rosenberg with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a method for automatically resetting the bezel to the said non-rotated position.

As to claim 32, Narayanaswami teaches a bezel being movable along a plane substantially parallel to said surface (see the rejection of claim 1 above), and Narayanaswami teaches a bezel being moved along a plane (col. 5 lines 35-60); however, Narayanaswami fails to teach a spring-like bezel for biasing said bezel to said non-rotated pivoted position. Rosenberg teaches a biasing said settings to said nonrotated position (fig. 20c; col. 57, lines 40 - 600). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine spring-like coupling of the said cursor to the non-rotated or original position taught by Rosenberg with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a method for automatically resetting the bezel to the said non-rotated position.

As to claims 27, 34, and 37, Narayanaswami teaches said bezel (see the rejection of claim 1 above); however, Narayanaswami fails to teach biasing to a substantially centered position. Rosenberg teaches a biasing said settings to said non-rotated position or centered position (fig. 20c; col. 57, lines 40 - 60). This biasing demonstrates biasing to a "substantially" centered position. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine biasing to a substantially centered position taught by Rosenberg with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a method for automatically resetting the bezel to the said non-rotated "centered" position.

4.   Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,222 B1) in view of Hunt (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,122).

As to claim 19, Narayanaswami fails to teach a movement sensor being an optical encoder. Hunt clearly teaches a movement sensor being an optical encoder (col. 3, lines 3 - 11). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine a movement sensor being an optical encoder taught by Hunt with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provides a method for entering input without making physical contact with the computing device.

5.   Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,222 B1) in view of Curchod (U.S. Patent No. 5,826,578).

As to claim 20, Narayanaswami fails to teach a movement sensor being a magnetic encoder. Curchod clearly teaches movement sensor being a magnetic encoder (col. 4, lines 1 - 15). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the movement sensor being a magnetic encoder taught by Curchod with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a method for entering data from magnetic mediums into the smart watch.

6.   Claims 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,222 B1) in view of DeLine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,420,075).

As to claim 21, Narayanaswami fails to teach cursor being responsive to movement of said bezel in combination with spoken commands. DeLine teaches said cursor being responsive to movement of said bezel in combination with spoken commands (col. 49, lines 20 - 28). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cursor being responsive to movement of said bezel in combination with spoken

commands taught by DeLine with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a

method for entering data with neither physical contact nor physical movement of the hands.

As to claim 24, Narayanaswami fails to teach cursor being responsive to movement of

said bezel in combination with spoken commands. DeLine teaches said cursor being responsive

to movement of said the bezel in combination with spoken commands (col. 49, lines 20 - 28). It

would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine the cursor being responsive to movement of said bezel in combination with spoken

commands taught by DeLine with the smart watch disclosed by Narayanaswami to provide a

method for entering data with neither physical contact nor physical movement of the hands.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed in Amendment A have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

Narayanaswami fails to disclose that a bezel is able to move horizontally and/or

vertically in parallel with the display surface.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Narayanaswami clearly teaches a bezel encircling a display screen (bezel, col. 5

lines 60-67, and figs. 4, 8A-B), the bezel is at least one of horizontally or vertically

movable (elements 310 and 312 of fig. 4 are selected/moved horizontally, and elements

314 and 316 are selected/moved vertically) along a plane substantially in parallel with the

display surface (the bezel 400 is moving parallel on the top of an annular plate 420 of fig.

6B when turning the bezel for selections).

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Truc T. Chuong

05/25/04